

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No.: 10/727,140

TC/Art Unit: 2442

Applicant: Juergen Heymann *et al.*

Conf. No.: 5327

Filing Date: December 2, 2003

Examiner: Bradford F. Fritz

Title: **SESSION-RETURN ENABLING STATEFUL WEB APPLICATIONS**

Mail Stop Amendment

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE AND AMENDMENT IN REPLY TO NON-FINAL
OFFICE ACTION OF NOVEMBER 9, 2011**

This amendment is responsive to the Non-Final Office Action mailed on November 9, 2011 in the above-referenced matter. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is requested in view of the amendments and remarks contained in the following pages:

A **Statement of Substance Regarding the Applicant-Initiated Interview** begins on page 2 of this paper.

Amendments to the Claims begin on page 3 of this paper.

Remarks begin on page 9 of this paper.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date indicated below in accordance with 37 CFR 1.8(a)(1)(i)(C).

2/8/11

Date of Transmission

/CCP/

Signature

Chelsea C. Pearsall

Typed or Printed Name of Person Signing Certificate

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE REGARDING THE APPLICANT-INITIATED
INTERVIEW**

Applicants appreciate the opportunity granted by Examiner Fritz to discuss the status of the current application during a telephonic interview conducted on January 26, 2011 between Examiner Fritz, the undersigned, and David Laney (Reg. No. 66,859), Applicants' co-representative. During the interview, the disclosure of the Iyengar reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,961,601) was discussed, particularly in relation to the alleged disclosure of generation of a session identifier (Session-ID) at a client. As asserted by Applicants, the converter 416 of Iyengar does not generate a Session-ID, but rather combines the Session-ID generated by the server with a User-ID provided by the client and with state information.

No agreement was reached during the interview. However, Examiner Fritz did agree to review the disclosure of Iyengar based on Applicants' formal written response to the pending Office Action. The Examiner also noted that features relating to a window ID as described in the instant specification at least at ¶[0040] and ¶[0051] did not appear to be described or suggested in the prior art of record.